THEOLOGY

VOL. LIV JUNE, 1951 No. 372

Editorial

THE time is not yet come when it is necessary to reach a conclusion about the proposals that have been made in the report on "Church Relations in England".[1] Moreover, it would be inappropriate for the Editor of THEOLOGY, who in his private capacity was a member of the Joint Conference which prepared the report, to recommend any particular conclusion, anyhow not at the present stage. Members of the churches concerned have rightly been urged to take their time in studying the report in an atmosphere which is free from pressure to take this side or that. The contributions to this number of THEOLOGY are designed to promote open and all-round reflection on the subject. The Bishop of Bristol and the Dean of Winchester record their first, provisional reactions to the report itself. But members of the Church of England need also to seek after a fuller understanding of how the non-episcopal churches approach the idea of reunion and not least the vexed question of episcopacy. We are glad to be able to publish Mr Payne's candid paper on this topic, since Anglicans are often unaware of the objections to which the claims commonly made for episcopacy are exposed. Again, it is not easy for Anglicans to come by information about what corresponds in the practice of non-episcopal churches to the rite of episcopal confirmation. We invited a minister of the Church of Scotland to explain what are the usages of his church in this matter, since its constitution is presbyterian and at the same time it is an established church, a circumstance which may make its methods of admission to church membership the more significant and instructive for the Church of England.

While the front door to reunion with the Church of Rome seems to be firmly bolted and barred, it is none the less possible and all the more desirable to make use of such channels of communication as are open. The Bishop of Durham's account of Father Congar's *Vraie et fausse Réforme dans l'Église* shows that there is plenty of common ground on which Roman and non-Roman theologians can have fruitful discussions.

From the purely theological point of view the most valuable and also the most promising documents concerning present and prospective church relations in England are the three reports that have been presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury in response to the questions he asked about the possibility of synthesizing the "catholic"

[1] *Church Relations in England*. Being the Report of Conversations between Representatives of the Archbishop of Canterbury and Representatives of the Evangelical Free Churches in England. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

and "protestant" traditions. We have already called attention to two of these reports—viz., *Catholicity*[1] and *The Catholicity of Protestantism*.[2] The third is now available—*The Fulness of Christ: the Church's Growth into Catholicity* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.). This is the work of a strong group of Anglican "evangelicals", and it is of the same high quality as the two previously published. Unlike the authors of *The Catholicity of Protestantism*, the members of this group resisted the temptation to engage in polemics with the authors of *Catholicity*, and instead set about answering the Archbishop's questions on their own merits. The result is that *The Fulness of Christ* is the most positive and constructive of the three reports, and certainly not the least conciliatory.

Church Relations in England—I

In his Presidential Address to the Convocation of Canterbury in September 1950 the Archbishop, in announcing the forthcoming publication of the report "Church Relations in England", used these words: "Indeed, if it were possible to hope it, I should hope that groups and committees and journals and people would on publication of the report be concerned in the first place with analysing exactly what are the underlying principles involved and discussing them, rather than in passing judgment on the report at once."

This salutary reminder of the need for careful and sustained scrutiny and reflection, before judgment is passed, imposes very definite limitations upon the scope and character of any such comment on the report as the editor has asked me to write. And I can only hope that in the attempt to record some of the impressions which a study of the report leaves on my mind I shall not seem to be disregarding an injunction I am most anxious to observe.

There should be no need to remind readers of Theology at any length of the starting-point of this latest series of conversations between Anglicans and Free Churchmen in the Archbishop's Cambridge sermon of 1946. The suggestion there put forward was that, since the direct road to full constitutional union is so beset with difficulties, the attempt should be made to explore the possibilities of "assimilation, of growing together towards full communion", by "a giving and receiving of episcopacy" which would provide a ministry recognized by Anglicans and Free Churchmen alike, and thus open the way to at least a partial sharing of one another's sacraments. It was the exploration of this possibility which formed the terms of reference of the conversations.

The first and, as it would seem to me, in many ways the most important advance made in the course of them is the recognition (p. 23) of this fact that the situation with which we have to deal is one which can rightly be described as one of "schism *within* the Church". By contrast with the attitude of Rome and the Orthodox

[1] See Theology, August, 1947, pp. 281 f.
[2] See Theology, October, 1950, pp. 361 f.

Church, none of the Churches represented in these discussions adopts the view that it alone is the true Church, from which all others are separated by schism which sets them outside the Church. In other words, they all recognize that the very fact of division makes it "impossible for separated communions, or for any one of them, to manifest the fulness of the life of the body. Each of the communions here represented embodies and mediates a measure of the truth and life of the Catholic Church of Christ, though all in varying ways and degrees fail to embody elements which belong to that truth and life".

This is a declaration of far-reaching theological, *and moral,* significance. From it there surely follows the acknowledgment that the entire life of every Church, its apprehension of Christian truth, its preaching of the Gospel, its ministration of Sacraments, its Orders, are, by the very fact of division, partially defective. If the fulness of truth and grace can be mediated only through a Church which is one, then manifestly we all in some measure need the restoration of that unity to give to our ministries and our ministrations that wholeness not only of recognition but of spiritual efficacy which at present they lack.

Such a view, fully and realistically accepted, could have a profound effect upon the whole spirit and temper in which any proposals for unity were considered. At the moment it is uncertain to what extent this view would win acceptance within any of our communions, certainly within the Church of England. And it is a matter of primary importance that this cardinal point should be given the prominence which it deserves, and be subjected to the most honest and searching scrutiny. For upon the acceptance or repudiation of it may well turn the possibility of breaking a deadlock, not of ecclesiastical argument, but of human self-sufficiency and pride, without which no further advance is going to be possible. "There is nothing to choose between us. We have all sinned and fallen short of the glory of God. And we are set right again only by this free gift of God's grace, through our redemption in Jesus Christ." Is it not possible that Paul's discovery of the common need of every individual soul may be true also of our churches?

It is that spirit which unmistakably inspired some of the closing sentences of the Archbishop's sermon. "What I desire is that I should be able freely to enter their churches, and they mine, in the Sacraments of the Lord and in the full fellowship of worship, that his life may freely circulate between us. Cannot we grow to full communion with each other before we start to write a constitution? Have we the wisdom, the humility, the love, and the spirit of Christ, sufficient for such a venture as I have suggested? If there were agreement on it, I would thankfully receive at the hands of others their commission in their accustomed form and in the same way confer our own; that is the mutual exchange of love and enrichment to which Lambeth, 1920, called us."

When we turn from this basic principle to examine the possibility of its expression in some practical form of mutual recognition, the

difficulties implicit in the Archbishop's suggestion of the Free Churches' "taking episcopacy into their system" appear formidable indeed. They are frankly stated and faced in the report. The suggestion is put forward (p. 43) that one of the Free Churches should "by examination, and if necessary by experiment", "discover whether episcopacy with its traditional functions [(1) of ordination, (2) of decision, in concurrence with presbyters and laity, in any suggested changes in matters of doctrine and policy, (3) of pastoral oversight of ministers and congregations (p. 39)] could be introduced into the system of that Free Church without disturbing unduly its structure and organization". One wonders what precisely the character of the "experiment" would be. It is difficult to avoid a feeling that it might be attended by a certain sense of unreality and self-consciousness: though of course developments which have taken place in more than one of the Free Churches have already provided some measure of such experimentation.

As the result of this first tentative development a stage might be reached at which "the Church of England might be asked to co-operate through its bishops in consecration of bishops for the Free Church". This would carry with it the adoption of "episcopal ordination as its rule for the future", and the recognition by the Church of England of such bishops and episcopally ordained presbyters as "duly commissioned and authorized" (p. 44). The obvious difficulty of the existence side by side in the same Church of episcopally and non-episcopally ordained ministers might, it is suggested, be removed, "if it were possible to work out by mutual agreement some form of further commissioning which would be satisfactory both to the Free Church and to the Church of England" (p. 44). In the paragraph already quoted the Archbishop stated that he "would thankfully receive at the hands of others their commission in their accustomed form" in addition to conferring that of the Church of England (p. 12). It is difficult to discern from the Conference conclusions whether this very significant suggestion was considered in discussion, or is envisaged as part of the proposed scheme.

The practical difficulties of pastoral oversight and discipline in the position arising from this episcopalization, partial episcopalization, of a Free Church are evident, and again are frankly recognized. Much would depend of course upon the wisdom, patience, and forbearance with which they were tackled. But even more would depend upon the enthusiasm and conviction with which the whole experiment was undertaken. If the Churches concerned, and that means the parishes and congregations, were fired with the realization that, no matter what the difficulties and anomalies with which they had to deal, they were embarked on a venture which could really lead to a deeply desired unity in Christ, then indeed the Spirit of God would have a chance to shape our stubborn wills, and our no less stubborn ecclesiastical systems, to his ends.

There is one further finding of the Conference which is of outstanding significance. "It would be recognized that the Free Church, though itself episcopal, or in process of becoming episcopal, would

yet continue to maintain the relations of fellowship and intercommunion which it at present enjoys with non-episcopal churches" (p. 45).

As was apparent in the debates on the Church of South India Report in the Convocations, the realization that this was an inescapable corollary of *union*, as distinct from *absorption*, was a source of considerable alarm and despondency in some quarters. It is indeed a principle which involves far-reaching consequences. And it is one which is likely enough to meet with considerable opposition. But it follows inevitably from the original recognition of "internal" schism. And it is one with which any realistic consideration of these proposals, or indeed of any proposals for union, must take reckoning. As the comment in the report notes: "This principle is as important to the Free Churches as the acceptance of episcopacy is to Anglicans." We have been warned.

In his letter inviting me to write this article the editor indicated that he was approaching me as one who would be likely to be in sympathy with the aims and conclusions of these consultations. I fear that what I have written may hardly have given that impression. I could most heartily wish that I could feel more hopeful and confident about the findings of the report. For I am indeed deeply and passionately in sympathy with any investigation and experiment which springs from, and may deepen, the desire to be delivered from the intolerable burden of the sin of our division, and still more of our apathy and complacency in face of it.

Perhaps I may be allowed to end with some kind of personal *confessio fidei* which may explain the hesitations which I feel about the line of approach which the Conference, like so many of its predecessors, felt bound to adopt.

For the last forty-three years, since the year when I went up to Oxford, it has been my great privilege and blessing, through association first with the Student Christian Movement and the World Student Christian Federation, and later with various aspects of the Ecumenical Movement, to have had the question of Christian unity pretty continuously in my mind and on my conscience. In a good many parts of Europe, and farther afield than that, I have been present at many gatherings of Christians drawn from all parts of the world, and representative of many diverse strands in the Christian tradition. I have known in these gatherings, across all frontiers of race and speech, across all frontiers of confession and denomination, a oneness in Christ which has made natural differences appear negligible, and ecclesiastical differences shameful. I have numbered among my spiritual pastors and masters, and my personal friends, men with whom I disagreed seriously on many points doctrinal and liturgical, in whom none the less I have seen graces of the Christian truth, manifested in a richness which made their "uncovenanted mercies" appear indistinguishable from my allegedly "covenanted" ones. I have experienced what, unless I am to deny every power of spiritual discernment which I possess, I believe to be a foretaste of unity in the Spirit, characterized by honesty and candour, under-

standing and sympathy, readiness to respect genuine differences of conviction, and active and vigorous co-operation in work for Christ.

In more recent years I have been allowed to serve in a more official capacity on committees concerned with the discussions of Church Unity, particularly with reference to questions raised by the coming into being of the Church of South India. In these latter gatherings one has sensed a strangely different atmosphere. No doubt considerable discount must be allowed for the difference between the unofficial, in a sense irresponsible, approach of student conferences, and the official authoritative deliberations of bishops and other Church representatives. But I cannot persuade myself that that is the whole explanation. I cannot resist the conviction that in these official deliberations the whole issue is too often approached from a standpoint the adoption of which almost inevitably dooms the discussion to sterility from the outset.

I am not expert in either dogmatics or ecclesiology, and I shall doubtless express my point amateurishly. But it seems to me that in many "Faith and Order" discussions we unconsciously allow ourselves to reverse the priority implied by the phrase: or, if that distinction is not tenable, that we allow questions of faith about Order to take precedence of questions of faith about Faith.

The same impression is left on my mind by the study of this report. As so often in these discussions, we find a very large measure of agreement on the faith of the Church. Quoting the declaration of the interim report (March 1949), the authors state:

> "On the doctrines of God the Father, the Person and Work of Christ, the Person and mission of the Holy Spirit, the Trinity, and the Life Everlasting, we have found nothing which separates any one of these communions from another. All acknowledge the apostolic faith as contained in the Scriptures and expressed in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds."

On this it is pertinent to quote the comment of the Principal of Jesus College, Oxford, in his review in *The Spectator* (1 December): "If this is common ground, thinks the layman, what a pity that there cannot here and now be 'more freedom of circulation' between the different parts of Christ's Church, to the enrichment of all."

But at this point, as always, we are brought up sharp by the fact that there remain stubborn differences in the sphere of Order. And at the root of these there is to be found the divergence of conviction about the nature of the Church, which turns on the possession or the lack of episcopacy. This is regarded as sufficient to outweigh the entire body of agreement on the faith. But the question which seems to stand out a mile from such a conclusion, which is none the less seldom asked, and never answered, is surely this. On the New Testament evidence, which is the right order of priority? Does the Faith determine the Order of the Church, or does the Order of the Church determine the Faith? If we seek to reform ourselves according to the word of God, to hear what the Spirit has to say to the churches, can there be any doubt?

ARTHUR BRISTOL.

II

This report is marked by the conciliatory spirit which one would expect of its signatories and of the weighty and representative membership of the Conference responsible for it; and its proposals are set out clearly and will be assured of careful and widespread consideration. It serves, moreover, to register the remarkable growth which has been taking place during the last forty years in understanding and fellow-feeling between the different Christian bodies in this country; and it is in full and thankful recognition of this process, and in the belief that it will go further, that I write my own necessarily brief comments and criticisms.

Assuming that the present situation of the Church may be described as one of "internal schism"—and on the whole I think that this account of the matter not only describes the facts, but also follows from the fact that the validity of Baptism, if administered with the right form, matter and intention, is recognized by all Christian bodies, whether Catholic or Protestant—the report proceeds to its principal proposal. This is that, in the case of any Free Church which "takes episcopacy into its system", intercommunion should be authorized between the members of that body and those of the Church of England. The result would be a system in this country of "parallel episcopates", all containing the Apostolic Succession so far as consecration and subsequent ordinations were concerned, but without being committed to any particular interpretation of the nature of episcopacy or of priesthood. At the same time, it is understood, at any rate by many members of the Conference, that this new system could only be agreed to if regarded as "provisional and transitory" and the earnest of a closer integration still.

The first point to be observed, I think, about the scheme is that it appears to involve a dichotomy in the idea of episcopacy which robs it of half its meaning. The Catholic principle of apostolic Order is maintained at the expense of the equally Catholic principle of Jurisdiction. For it is of the essence of episcopacy that the bishop should be the hub and centre of the Church's cohesion within his diocese; and indeed no candid man can doubt that for the preservation of cohesion in any body, community or institution some settled provision for its good order and government—in other words, some jurisdiction—is necessary. Catholic principle is, therefore, reinforced here by the manifest needs of human nature. In the second century, moreover, it was this continuity of jurisdiction rather than the idea of sacramental continuity through ordination and consecration which was dominant in the notion of Apostolic Succession. Parallel episcopates mean, in effect, overlapping episcopates. Would that in fact make for order in the Church? I cannot think so. There are many examples of schisms in the early centuries—as indeed there are to-day—where episcopacy exists on both sides of the division; and they were not the less damaging for that. My own fear is that the existing schisms between episcopal and non-episcopal bodies, which at least rest theologically on a clear issue, would become even more

serious and intractable if they became schisms between different episcopal bodies; and confusion would be worse confounded.

Supporters of the scheme can point to its "provisional and transitory" character and urge that this overlapping of jurisdiction is one of the features in it which may be expected to disappear in due course. But is there any solid ground for believing that things will go that way? It occurred to me, when I read the report, that some light might be thrown on this question by the present state of affairs and trends of opinion in the Methodist Episcopal Church of America, particularly in its relations with the Anglican Communion. In reply to inquiries, I have received through a friend[1] a letter from a priest[2] in the United States who was for fifteen years in the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church and is now vicar of a parish in the Middle West. The letter is too long to quote in full: but the writer states that (1) "in the Methodist Church in this country the so-called 'episcopate' and 'episcopal system' show very little relationship to the patterns of the historic episcopate of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church"; (2) "with the consolidation of the three principal branches of American Methodism (the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methodist Protestant Church) the term 'Episcopal' was dropped from their titles and now the united body is known simply as the Methodist Church"; and (3) "on the basis of my experience with Methodists in the south-west and eastern parts of the United States, and also in England and in Scotland, I am not at all prepared to believe that sufficient progress has yet been made among the Methodists for them to be fully prepared to choose and follow the full-orbed faith, practice, and tradition, of the church".

The position thus revealed, and particularly the formal abandonment of the title "Episcopal" by the new body now constituted, is full of warning. Acceptance of episcopacy without any doctrine of what it means guarantees not even so much as a name. If it be urged that the Methodist Episcopal Church in America never had the Apostolic Succession, and that matters might otherwise have gone differently, the answer can well be made that that is to expect too much of the mere fact of Succession, and that in any case such a rejoinder comes ill from those who themselves disown its necessity.

The American experience shows that things may just as well go wrong as right, unless there is agreement beforehand as to the sense in which terms are used. Finally, if it be urged that the scheme contemplates England and not the United States, I would reply that Church principles know no frontiers and that the Church of England, with its constant appeal to antiquity as well as to Scripture cannot handle these issues on purely insular lines.

I write as one who, while believing that the time for schemes of this kind has not come, yet values greatly the steadily increasing contacts between Church leaders and theologians on all sides. But

[1] The Rev. F. J. Bloodgood, D.D., Rector of Trinity Episcopal Church, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

[2] The Rev. C. Clyde Heggard, Vicar of St John's Episcopal Church, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

wounds must be allowed to heal slowly, if they are to heal well, and if we believe that the present tide towards Reunion is really God's work we shall not wish to hurry it. The issue which I believe underlies the whole process (and indeed much else that is afoot in the world to-day) is that of authority, and until that issue is tackled on a far larger scale than is the case at present, I do not think we shall get much farther. But that is another matter, and one that may well call for at least a century of work. E. G. SELWYN.

Free Church Objections to Episcopacy[1]

WHEN invited to prepare this paper, I was inclined to reply that the Free Churches have no objections to Episcopacy. If the word be understood according to the primary meaning of *ἐπισκοπή* and *ἐπισκοπέω*, then the Free Churches have, and have always had, their own ways of exercising it. To prove that that is no debating point one may cite the categorical words of Dom Gregory Dix. "We should all be a long step nearer agreement," he says, "if we recognized that the modern Protestant societies cannot be 'given' or 'asked to accept' *episkopē* in the ancient sense at all, because they already have it. It is an inseparable accompaniment of any corporate Christian life."[2]

Clearly, however, when the Archbishop of Canterbury used the word "episcopacy" in his Cambridge sermon he used it in a narrower and more specialized sense. He was referring to what is generally known as an episcopal system of church order. Representatives of an "episcopal" church are conferring with representatives of "non-episcopal" churches, and it is right that the latter should be asked to state as clearly and frankly as possible why they have been and are "non-episcopal" in the commonly accepted meaning of the word. But this does not dispose of one's initial difficulties. There remains the delicate and formidable task of finding a satisfactory definition of what is really meant by an episcopal system of church order. No small part of the objection of the Free Churches to episcopacy lies in the fact that it has become difficult to the point of impossibility to find an agreed definition of what episcopacy really is.

Dr Darwell Stone defined it as "that system of the Church in which bishops (in the ordinary modern sense of the word 'bishop') fill the offices on which the continued life of the Church depends".[3] His article must have been written nearly forty years ago. One gathers from even a slight acquaintance with some of the modern literature on the subject that to-day many of those Anglicans who have an initial sympathy with the general standpoint Dr Darwell Stone represented would prefer to omit the clause he places in brackets—"in the ordinary modern sense of the word 'bishop' ". On the other hand, many other Anglicans would have difficulty in accepting as it stands the concluding clause—"on which the continued life of the Church depends". But if we take out both clauses we are left with a sentence which is near tautology.

In the discussions of the last thirty years the phrase most often

[1] A paper read to the Joint Conference on 5 September 1949.
[2] *The Apostolic Ministry*, 1946, p. 295. [3] *E.R.E.*, V, p. 332.

used has been one first adopted by the Lambeth Conference of 1888 —namely, "the historic episcopate". At first sight it might seem that our subject would be both clarified and simplified were it stated in the form; what are the Free Church objections to the historic episcopate? But that, of course, is not the case, for it is obvious that the phrase "the historic episcopate" is question-begging and ambiguous. What its authors intended by it is now the subject of considerable controversy. They spoke of "the historic episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and people called of God into the unity of his Church". We are reminded by the Bishop of Oxford and the Bishop of Chichester that, according to Bishop Stubbs, when the bishops used the phrase in 1888 they meant "not merely a method of Church government (in which sense it would hardly be called historic)" but "a distinct, substantive and historic transmission of the commission of the Apostles in and by which our Lord formed his disciples into a distinctly organized body or Church".[1] The Lambeth Conference of 1930 offered an elaborate gloss on the phrase which stated that it implied "the succession in office and the succession of consecration" together with certain "generally recognized functions; the general superintendence of the Church and more especially of the clergy; the maintenance of unity in the one Eucharist; the ordination of men to the ministry; the safeguarding of the faith; and the administration of the discipline of the Church".[2] On the other hand, Bishop Stephen Neill assures us that when the phrase "the historic episcopate" is used in modern discussions, and schemes such as that of the United Church of South India, it is intended to express the element of historic continuity "and nothing else".[3]

Professor J. P. Hickinbotham would have us think of episcopacy as "the traditional order of the Church's ministry", and declares that "the plain interpretation of the Anglican formularies" is that it is "*a* valuable witness to and safeguard of the Church's unity and continuity".[4] This seems innocent enough. What objections, if any, have the Free Churches to an order of bishops as a valuable witness to and safeguard of the Church's unity and continuity? But many would desire at once to rephrase the question so that it runs: What objections have the Free Churches to *the* order of bishops as *the* witness to and safeguard of the Church's unity and continuity? One cannot forget that the Bishop of Oxford speaks of episcopacy as "the authentic guarantee of its [i.e. the Church's] claim to be indeed the Body of Christ among men".[5] The Bishop of London criticizes even the authors of *The Apostolic Ministry* for treating the idea of succession in isolation and for giving too little attention to superintendence and what he calls "managerial succession",[6] which he believes to be the essential function of the divinely ordained episcopate.

[1] Kirk, *The Apostolic Ministry*, p. 47 n.; Bell, *Christian Unity; The Anglican Position*, 1948, p. 180. [2] Cp. Bell, *op. cit.*, pp.181–2.
[3] *The Ministry of the Church*, 1947, p. 19. [4] *Ibid.*, pp. 33, 34.
[5] *The Apostolic Ministry*, p. 46.
[6] J. W. C. Wand, *The Church, its Nature, Structure and Function*, 1949, pp. 78–79.

Three hundred or more years ago most of the Reformed Churches dispensed with a separated episcopal order of ministry. They may be forgiven for showing hesitation in resuming it, when within only one episcopal communion—namely, the Anglican Church—there are so many and such varying views about what Episcopacy implies.

Various reasons led the Free Churches—in common with most of the Lutheran and all continental Reformed churches—to break with the episcopal order of ministry which had admittedly been traditional for thirteen or fourteen hundred years. These reasons may be conveniently divided into three groups: biblical, theological and historical. They are still largely operative, and they form a threefold cord which will not easily be broken.

First, the biblical reasons. All the Reformation churches have appealed to Scripture in matters of doctrine. The Separatists and Nonconformists appealed also to Scripture in matters of Church order. In common with Luther and Calvin[1] they rejected the threefold order of ministry—bishops, presbyters and deacons—which had become traditional, on the ground that in the New Testament and the early Church *πρεσβύτερος* and *ἐπίσκοπος* were interchangeable terms. The Reformers could appeal to the authority of Jerome for this view, and did so. In the latter part of the sixteenth century and throughout the seventeenth century there was little dispute on this matter between Anglicans and those who criticized the Elizabethan settlement. In his controversy with Cartwright, Archbishop Whitgift appears to have agreed that in New Testament times "he that was a Pastor, or Elder, was also a Bishop; and the Bishop in like sort called Elder". He and those who thought with him made little attempt to appeal to Scripture on behalf of Elizabeth's bishops. Strype prints a document found among the archbishop's papers which says: "The Bishops of this realm do not (so far as I ever yet heard) nor must not, claim to themselves any greater authority than is given them by the statute of the 25. of K. Henry VIII revived in the first year of her Majesty's reign. . . . For if it had pleased her Majesty, with the wisdom of the realm, to have used no Bishops at all, we could not have complained justly, of any defect in our Church."[2] Whitgift defended Anglican episcopacy on grounds of royal authority and expediency. The same is broadly true of Hooker. He believed the government of the Church by bishops "best agreeth with the sacred Scripture", but he did not rest the weight of his argument there, but on the reasonableness of

[1] Cp. H. H. Kramm, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, 1947, pp. 85 f. with references; Calvin, *Institutes*, IV, iii, 8, etc.; J. H. S. Burleigh, *Scottish Journal of Theology*, vol. 2, No. 3 (September 1949), p. 305: "The dispute between Presbytery and Episcopacy in Scotland, at all events, has little or nothing to do with the historical question of the identity of bishop and presbyter. It is solely concerned with the nature of the episcopal office as held forth in Scripture. Andrew Melville and his friends and followers maintained that in Scripture the episcopal office implied a ministry of word and sacraments to a particular flock, and that in the Kirk there is no superior office."

[2] Strype, *The Life and Acts of John Whitgift*, i, 601; iii, p. 222. F. J. Shirley, *Richard Hooker and Contemporary Political Ideas*, p. 29, quotes Whitgift's *Works*, I, 180–1 184–5, 187, for even more outspoken views—e.g., "That any one kind of government is so necessary that without it the Church cannot be

episcopacy as a practical system.[1] On the other hand, the Puritan party generally, a conservative like Baxter as well as those of the left wing, stood for "the parity of presbyters" as a Scriptural principle from which it was wrong and dangerous to depart.

This traditional Free Church attitude was reinforced—seemed, indeed, to be convincingly and finally established—by Bishop Lightfoot's classic *Dissertation on the Christian Ministry* (1868; reaffirmed 1881). Free Church writers like R. W. Dale[2] were content to base themselves on Lightfoot's view of the evidence of the New Testament and the early centuries, and to assert their belief that it is preferable to conform to the New Testament practice than to adopt a hierarchical order which developed well after the apostolic period. Until recently few Anglican theologians based their pleas for episcopacy upon the New Testament. Even Dr Darwell Stone in the article already cited wrote that "he [i.e. the writer] is conscious that the really decisive argument to his mind for episcopacy as a practical system is derived from its continuous and universal acceptance in the Church, from at any rate the middle of the second century to the sixteenth century".[3] This has not seemed a decisive argument to those who have desired to model their church life as well as their doctrine as closely as possible on that of the New Testament.

In attempting to base a high view of episcopacy on the evidence of the New Testament the authors of *The Apostolic Ministry* have entered a field which even they admit has not usually been that frequented by Anglican apologists. When Dom Gregory Dix appeals on behalf of the doctrine of Apostolic Succession from the Caroline bishops cited by Professor Sykes back to Scripture and primitive tradition he can speak only of "the slow and fitful but increasing understanding of what that appeal involves".[4] It may well be that the evidence must be worked over once more. It may well be that neither the Reformers nor Bishop Lightfoot nor Dr Streeter gave an adequate account of the New Testament ministry. But it cannot be said that at the moment New Testament scholars as a whole—either Anglican, Free Church or Continental—show any disposition to accept the theory that an apostolate transmitted its authority to an episcopate and that that, and that only, is in its continuing succession the essential ministry in the Church.

Free Churchmen have an inherited prejudice in favour of a New Testament church order, and if it be asked, What are their objections to episcopacy? the answer must be, first of all, that it does not seem to them to accord with the practice in the apostolic church.

But this matter is one not only of New Testament practice which now or later may be decided by New Testament scholars. It passes into the realm of theology and touches the nature of the Gospel itself. Bishop Neill has said that he feels bound to reject the par-

saved, or that it may not be altered into some other kind thought to be more expedient, I utterly deny."

[1] Cp. F. J. Shirley, *op. cit.*, pp. 108–9, 249, 235, 256.

[2] E.g., *Manual of Congregational Principles*, 1884.

[3] *E.R.E.*, V, p. 336.

[4] THEOLOGY, LII, No. 348, p. 224.

ticular view of episcopacy put forward by the authors of *The Apostolic Ministry* because he cannot recognize as Christian the doctrine of God which seems to underlie it.[1] Free Churchmen generally have been inclined to say something like that about episcopacy as such, certainly about episcopacy insisted on as a necessary and uniform system of church order. An authoritarian ministry of this kind has seemed to them out of keeping with the spirit as well as the letter of the New Testament and difficult to reconcile with the ways of God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as there set forth. It seems to be almost inevitably bound up with matters of prestige, privilege, and authority, which fit ill with the nature and method of our Lord's mission. Do not the very words which Hooker quotes with approval about "bishops, having permanent superiority and ruling power over other ministers of the word and sacraments",[2] jar on one in view of Matthew 23, Philippians 2, and countless other New Testament passages? Is there not bound up with the very notion of episcopacy as the vehicle of succession in office and succession of consecration a quasi-mechanical theory of grace and an impoverished doctrine of the work of the Holy Spirit? The Free Churches have feared so, and not the Free Churches alone. *Pastores pastorum*, senior ministers who give counsel and direction to their fellow ministers and exercise certain administrative functions, may be a useful, seemly, practical device, but the episcopacy we are asked to accept when "the historic episcopate" is spoken of is an order which has Confirmation and Ordination as its sole prerogative. Can this separation between those who may confirm and ordain and those who may only preach and administer the sacraments be defended theologically, except in terms which Reformed Churchmen feel bound to repudiate? The issue is made harder rather than easier when one hears tributes to the numinous aura or "character" attaching to the episcopal office as such, moving as these tributes often are. They pass into a region which Sir Henry Lunn once described as "sacerdotal mysticism",[3] a region in which Free Churchmen have never felt at home.

There is a famous chapter in the late John Oman's book *Vision and Authority* in which the author tries to answer the question: "Who has succeeded to Peter's blessing and is in possession of Peter's power?"[4] In seven searching, almost blistering, pages Oman defends the succession, not of office, but of insight and of love. In these pages all is really said that Free Churchmen would wish to say on this matter. Certainly what Oman so powerfully expresses would be felt in his bones by the average inarticulate Free Churchman if he learned that after defining the Apostolic Commission as the continuing of our Lord's work, the proclamation of the Gospel to all nations, and the pastoral oversight of the flock, Father Hebert declared that "the bishop alone holds in its fulness, and is empowered to hand

[1] *The Ministry of the Church*, p. 28.
[2] *Ecclesiastical Polity*, VII. iii. 1, v. 10.
[3] *Episcopacy Ancient and Modern*, 1930, p. 395.
[4] *Op. cit.*, 2nd edition, 1928, pp. 131 f.

on" this Apostolic Commission.[1] Or, if he heard that Dom Gregory Dix had declared that

> The episcopate is the only means by which our Lord's own commission to stand in his Person before God and man is given afresh to each new minister of his Church (according to his own order) to the end of time. Apart from that "theory"—or rather fact [*sic*]—episcopacy has no particular meaning and need not be treated as anything but an administrative convenience, to be retained or abandoned or bargained about as occasion may serve.[2]

Not to mince words, it must be stated that such statements seem to Free Churchmen not only to be theologically false but to verge on the impious. And if it be said that this is only one interpretation of episcopacy, and that a system like an individual may need to be saved from its friends, then Free Churchmen are entitled to hesitate until they are clearer what theology is involved. Theologians, philosophers and even historians are less willing to believe that fact and interpretation can be separated than they were a few years ago.

A sentence from Mr Daniel Jenkins's book *The Gift of Ministry* is here to the point. He is not on every matter a representative Free Churchman, but here, I believe, he speaks for all, and what he says is in line with Oman's chapter. Episcopacy as a claim to succession, he writes, "implies an external and formal conception of succession which seems to deny the 'passionate subjectivity' of faith and an impatience with the dispensation of the Church under the cross under which we live. . . ."[3]

But, in addition to biblical and theological objections to episcopacy as it is usually presented, Free Churchmen have difficulties which rest on history. Can an episcopal system of Church order be said to have justified itself in experience? Here, perhaps, we might seem to be on rather less debatable ground than that already traversed, for even the authors of *The Apostolic Ministry* are ready again and again to repudiate much in the attitude and position of the bishops in every age since the romantic first and second centuries of which we know so inconveniently—or is it conveniently?—little. Even Dr Farrer is ready to say that the Reformers were "historically justified",[4] though he hastens to add "not doctrinally".

The appeal which Free Churchmen make to history is a twofold one, negative and positive. There are, on the one hand, their own extremely unfortunate experiences at the hands of bishops. There is, on the other, their certainty of the presence and blessing of God on their own non-episcopally ordered fellowships. Episcopacy has admittedly so often passed into prelacy that the suspicion, if not the

---

[1] *The Form of the Church*, 1944, pp. 111, 113.

[2] *The Apostolic Ministry*, p. 303.

[3] *Op. cit.*, 1947, p. 53. Cp. T. F. Torrance, *Scottish Journal of Theology*, vol. 2, No. 3 (September 1949), p. 250: "Surely the essential form of the visible Church wherein she images her Lord is to be found in her humble service in which the great reconciliation already wrought out in the Body of Christ is lived out among men, and the Church in life and action becomes, as it were, sacramentally correlative to the life and passion of Jesus Christ."

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 179.

hostility, of past ages is readily to be understood. No Free Churchman would wish to-day to criticize bishops in the terms used by Cartwright and Penry, much less to indulge in the scurrilities of Martin Marprelate. On the contrary, the Anglican episcopate as a whole has won the deep respect and gratitude of countless Free Churchmen by the religious leadership it has given both locally and nationally. As Professor C. H. Dodd has suggested, many non-theological, non-doctrinal factors enter into the average Free Churchman's attitude to episcopacy.[1] Some of them are, at this time of day, not very worthy or relevant, but it has to be recognized that they are there and have to be overcome if any kind of episcopacy is to secure wide acceptance.

More important, and still on the negative side, is the fact that episcopacy has not in practice succeeded in maintaining either the unity of the Church, the continuity of the Church, or the purity of its doctrine. When it is suggested that the bishops in the so-called Catholic succession are the "guardians and guarantees of the unity of the Church",[2] or that they are "the persons responsible for the guardianship of Christian doctrine",[3] Free Churchmen who know a little history are apt to become impatient. What then of the story of the Arian controversy, what of the Reformation, what of the Anglican episcopate in the eighteenth century, to come no nearer to our own time? What of the fact that the Orthodox Churches recognize only those who adhere to the Greek Orthodox Church as within the one Church of God on earth, and regard Roman Catholics as "heretical and schismatic"? What of the fact that the Roman Church regards equally the Orthodox Churches and the Anglican Church as outside the one Church; and as tainted with false doctrines? What of the fact that the Orthodox Churches recognize that a General Council of Bishops is an impracticable ideal? Do these facts support the claim that the unity and continuity of the Church of God on earth is preserved and safeguarded only by episcopal succession, and that both unity and apostolicity depend on it? It is perhaps time that there be reprinted or rewritten the *Unparteiische Kirchen und Ketzerhistorie* which Gottfried Arnold wrote in the closing years of the seventeenth century, for there is at least a grain of truth in the epigram that "the true Church in any generation is to be found with those who have just been excommunicated from the actual church".

The main appeal which the Free Churches make to history is, however, a positive one. Though non-episcopal in their Church order, they believe that both in the Old World and the New, both in the West and in the lands of the Younger Churches, in their fellowship and service, and in their sacramental worship, they have known the Presence of their Lord and the power of the Holy Spirit. They believe that they have shared with other communions in a real and full sense in the carrying out of the Apostolic Commission. They do

[1] Letter 25 June 1949 to the Faith and Order Department of the World Council of Churches.

[2] Dr Kirk in *The Apostolic Ministry*, p. 43.

[3] A. G. Hebert, *The Form of the Church*, p. 111.

not think of themselves as illegitimate children in the family of the Church of God. They claim, as jealously as any, the great traditional words about the earthly Body of Christ: One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic. They are concerned, as others are, for unity and continuity in the faith. But they would agree with Dr Walter Horton: "The only strictly necessary requirements for a Christian Church are two: *some* means of historical continuity with the incarnate Lord, and *some* means of communion with the Living Lord."[1] The Free Churches believe they have had in their midst those who may rightly be called apostolic figures, that the apostolate has been continued for them by "the signs of the Apostle". But they cannot think that Carey was not truly apostolic because he never received episcopal ordination, and Wesley somewhat less doubtfully apostolic because John Potter's episcopal hands were laid upon him. Daniel Jenkins speaks of "the rude exuberance of Christian life and experience outside the confines of the episcopalian churches".[2] Those who know and love the Free Churches best would not deny it, but the source of the exuberance lies in the Gospel itself.

The objections that have been mentioned are still the ones which have to be faced and overcome if any kind of episcopacy is to be given to or taken by the Free Churches. There have of course been a number of developments in the way in which ἐπισκοπή is exercised over churches and individuals within certain of the Free Churches. Some of these involve the exercise by certain ministers of functions similar to those exercised in episcopal churches by bishops.

Individual Free Churchmen have often declared themselves willing to look sympathetically on some kind of episcopal order of ministry. Richard Baxter, though he declined the Lord Chancellor's offer of the bishopric of Hereford in 1660, advised his friend Edward Reynolds to accept that of Norwich, though strictly upon the terms of a Royal Declaration which the episcopate as a whole soon forgot or repudiated.[3] Robert Hall, the famous Baptist preacher of the early years of the nineteenth century, said he should have no conscientious objection to episcopacy as he believed it to have been practised in the second and third centuries.[4] "I have no objection to episcopacy in itself," said P. T. Forsyth. "I could do my work happily under a bishop, and feel honoured under the episcopate of many. . . . We do protest, however, as Christians, against an episcopal (as we do against a Presbyterian or a Congregational) monopoly of Church or Gospel, against polity as a condition of Church unity."[5]

Baxter, Robert Hall, and P. T. Forsyth would surely all have welcomed the Cambridge sermon of the present Archbishop of Canterbury, as did multitudes of ordinary Free Churchmen. They would have desired to discuss it with their Anglican brethren. But they would have pressed the question, as we must in view of past and

[1] *Ecumenical Review*, I, No. 4 (Summer 1949), p. 381.
[2] *The Gift of Ministry*, p. 54.
[3] Cp. John Stoughton, *History of Religion in England*, 4th ed., 1901, III, p. 116 f.; Irvonwy Morgan, *The Nonconformity of Richard Baxter*, 1946, pp. 125–128 *et passim*.
[4] *Works*, 1839, edn. 1, p. 119.
[5] *The Church and the Sacraments*, 2nd ed., 1947, pp. 45–46.

present experience, What exactly is the nature of the episcopacy which it is suggested the Free Churches should "take into their own system"? Does it avoid the difficulties which Free Churchmen have felt and still feel regarding most of the episcopal systems they have known?

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

Confirmation in the Church of Scotland[1]

THE rite of Confirmation, as presently practised in the Church of Scotland, is closely associated with two other matters: the preparation of the candidates (as the Church of Scotland describes the baptized but unconfirmed), which culminates in their ratification of their baptismal vows before the Church; and their reception to Holy Communion. The preparation, naturally, precedes confirmation, and reception to the Lord's Table follows confirmation.

Preparation for Confirmation.—From the beginning of the Reformation in Scotland, the importance of due preparation and instruction before reception to the sacrament of Holy Communion was emphasized. *The Scots Confession* of 1560 makes this clear in the article entitled *To whom the Sacraments Appertain.* "We confess and acknowledge," the article runs, "that Baptism appertains as well to the infants of the faithful, as unto them that be of age and discretion: And so we damn the error of the *Anabaptists*, who deny Baptism to appertain to children, before they have faith and understanding. But the Supper of the Lord, we confess to appertain to such only as be of the Household of Faith, and can try and examine themselves, as well in their faith, as in their duty towards their neighbours; such as eat and drink at that Holy Table without faith, or being at dissension and division with their brethren, do eat unworthily: And therefore it is, that in our Kirk our Ministers take public and particular examination of the knowledge and conversation of such as are to be admitted to the Table of the Lord Jesus."

In recent times, however, diverse and widespread doubts have been expressed regarding the particularness with which the "knowledge and conversation" of candidates have been examined prior to their confirmation. A recent innovation in the religious life of Scotland has been the meeting in Edinburgh of an annual concourse of delegates from parochial youth organizations. In 1949 this Youth Assembly declared that "among Church members there is an appalling ignorance of Christian teaching, both as regards theory and practice; this results either in a state of bewilderment in the mind of youth, or in an unreasonable and frequently unintelligent attitude towards life and our faith". As a remedy there was suggested "the use of a syllabus for communicants' classes which would give fuller understanding of the Christian faith, and which would help those about to become communicants to realize their responsibilities".

[1] The writer is indebted to the Rev. W. D. Maxwell, Ph.D., for valuable help in the preparation of this article.

In the same year, the General Assembly of the Church received an Overture from the Presbytery of Kirkcudbright, which bade the Fathers and Brethren consider "how precise, thorough, and determined are the propaganda and methods of instruction employed by the Communists in their challenge to the youth of to-day, and how correspondingly vague, sporadic, and ineffective is much of the Church's instruction of youth", and which, *inter alia*, declared that "for generations past, in the absence of any uniform, systematic, or properly defined course of instruction and probation for communicant membership, the preparation of candidates by ministers has been unduly abbreviated and desultory, and in not a few cases virtually ignored".

Though the reverend committee to whom this Overture was remitted could not be enamoured of the rash lack of discretion in some of its terms, it was not thereby to be deceived into thinking that the essential concern which it expressed was not symptomatic of a grave and general perturbation throughout the Church. In the event, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the committee, instructed "presbyteries to make an immediate survey in the parishes within their bounds of the situation as regards preparation for Communion, and in the light of this survey to take such steps as they think necessary for its improvement". This Deliverance was duly communicated to the presbyteries, together with the committee's report, in which it was proposed that confirmation classes "should ordinarily meet once weekly over a period of two or three months, and that the work should include the memorizing of the Ten Commandments, our Lord's Commandments, and the Apostles' Creed". The presbytery to which the writer belongs, and many others, have by now given effect to the instruction of the General Assembly, and recommended to ministers and Kirk Sessions that confirmation courses should be of not less than twelve weeks' duration, and that a standard scheme of instruction, as outlined in the Assembly Committee's report, should be followed.

The first month of this course is devoted to exposition of the central doctrines of the faith: belief in God the Father; in Jesus Christ, Saviour and Lord; in the Holy Spirit, the Sanctifier. Another month is reserved for "The Means of Grace": the Bible, and the need for regular and intelligent study thereof; Prayer, private and corporate; the Lord's Day, and the meaning and discipline of common worship; the Christian Year; the Sacraments. The remainder of the time is given up to teaching on the origin, history, and function of the Church, and to the privileges and responsibilities of communicant membership therein.

While it has always been the practice of the writer, and of many ministers, to insist upon regular attendance at a course of instruction not much, if at all, less rigorous than that now officially commended, there is little doubt that many others have hitherto been much more easily satisfied. There is, therefore, some ground for confidence that, in coming days, a higher level of understanding and appreciation of communicant membership may be attained.

Even so, the Church is not satisfied that its standards are sufficiently high. In Scotland, as possibly also elsewhere, ministers are frequently, in their confirmation classes, confronted by many who, until their appearance therein, have not been noted for zeal in attendance upon religious occasions. There is a growing feeling, which has found expression in the print of Assembly reports, that all such should be required to give evidence of their seriousness by presenting themselves diligently at Sunday worship over a period of months before they are accepted as candidates for confirmation, when they should then be obliged to submit to the twelve weeks' course. But there are many, again—the children of those who are still loosely described as "guid kirk folk"—who reach the confirmation class as the culmination of their progress through Sunday School and Bible Class and the other youth organizations of the Church. For these, whose sustained allegiance the Church can still in varying measure command, the General Assembly's Committee on the Religious Instruction of Youth is now actively preparing a First Communicants' Course which, at twenty-four lectures a year, would extend over two years. An early draft of this course proposes twelve lectures on the Bible, twelve on doctrine, seven on church history, and five on the means of grace.

When the course of instruction has been completed, the minister, provided he is satisfied that all the candidates have been baptized, and have proved their diligence under instruction, submits their names for approval to the elders of the Church, met and constituted as a Kirk Session. They are then ready to be publicly examined, and this examination has always been made in face of the congregation, either at a weeknight service of preparation for Holy Communion, or, as with increasing frequency in these days, and as recommended in a report to the General Assembly of 1950, after the sermon at the morning service on the Sunday immediately preceding that on which the Sacrament is to be celebrated.

This is done in the manner prescribed in *The Book of Common Order of the Church of Scotland* (1940), under the title "Order for the Confirmation of Baptized Persons, and for Their Admission to the Lord's Table". The names of the candidates are read out, and they take their places, standing, before the Holy Table. The minister recalls to them their ingrafting into Christ by Holy Baptism, and bids them "to profess their faith in the Lord Jesus, to consecrate themselves to Him, and thereby to bind themselves anew to His service". A confession of faith is called for, by assent, preferably, to the Apostles' Creed, or, alternatively, to the question:

> Do you confess your faith in God as your heavenly Father, in Jesus Christ as your Saviour and Lord, and in the Holy Spirit as your sanctifier?

Two further questions are put—namely:

> Do you promise, in dependence on Divine Grace, to serve the Lord and walk in His ways all the days of your life?

and

> Do you promise to make diligent use of the means of grace, to share dutifully in the worship and service of the Church, and to give of your substance, as the Lord may prosper you, for the advancement of His kingdom throughout the world?

The Confirmation.—After the candidates have ratified their baptismal vows by satisfactory answers to these questions, confirmation by the Holy Spirit takes place. The candidates kneel, and the minister prays for the strengthening (or "confirming") power of the Holy Spirit, with his sevenfold gifts, upon them.[1] Then. "raising his hand in blessing over the candidates, or laying his hand on the head of each", the minister says:

> The God of all grace, who hath called you to His eternal glory, confirm you to the end, that you may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.
>
> Forasmuch as you have made confession of your faith, I do now, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, the great King and Head of the Church, admit you to the fellowship of the Lord's Table.
>
> God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit bless, preserve, and keep you, now and forever more. Amen.

"The Lord bless thee . . ." may then be sung by the congregation.

Reception of the Confirmed to the Lord's Table.—The candidates having been confirmed by prayer for the Holy Spirit and by benediction, or laying on of hands by the minister, brief prayers of thanksgiving and supplication are said, including "Defend them, O Lord, with thy heavenly grace . . .", and concluded by the Lord's Prayer; after which the right hand of fellowship is given by the minister (and possibly also by representatives of the Kirk Session). A brief exhortation is then delivered:

> Beloved in the Lord, now received into all the privileges of membership in the Church of Christ; consider well that you are indeed fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom also ye are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit. . . .

The service concludes with praise, and the benediction.

General Observations.—The title of the service, it will be noted, does not speak of the confirmation of baptismal vows, but of the confirmation of baptized persons. This is important. The rite does not represent an act which derives its merit from the will of the one

[1] "Almighty and ever-living God, strengthen these thy servants, we beseech thee, with the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, and daily increase in them thy manifold gifts of grace: the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord; and keep them in thy mercy unto life enternal; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

who has ratified the vows, but an act which begins in God, who through the Church, confirms, by the strengthening power of his Holy Spirit, what he has already done in baptism, and bestows the sevenfold gifts of the Spirit. Thus the Church maintains its fidelity to its subordinate standards, since *The Larger Catechism* of 1648 declares that "The sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper agree, In that the author of both is God; the spiritual part of both is Christ and His Benefits; both are seals of the same Covenant . . .", and further declares that "The sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper differ, In that Baptism is to be administered but once, with Water, to be a sign and seal of our Regeneration and Ingrafting into Christ, and that even to Infants; whereas the Lord's Supper is to be administered often, in the elements of Bread and Wine, to represent and exhibit Christ as Spiritual Nourishment to the Soul, and to confirm our Continuance and Growth in him, and that only to such as are of Years and Ability to examine themselves." So, in the service, the important element is the God-to-man movement, and the ratification of baptismal vows by the candidate is a mere preliminary—a profession of the faith into which he was baptized—before he receives the confirming and strengthening power of the Holy Spirit, conferred through the Church as God's minister on earth. Thus the grace of Holy Baptism is nourished in him; and confirmed to him at ever deeper levels of experience in proportion as he eats and drinks with faith, and worthily.

The Scottish Rite Compared.—The purpose of this article has been simply to describe what is done about confirmation in the Church of Scotland, and not to argue about the doctrine or history of the rite. At the same time, it may be useful to readers of Theology to have before them a brief statement by two representative Scottish theologians concerning the relation between confirmation in the Church of Scotland and the corresponding rite in other traditions. H. J. Wotherspoon and J. M. Kirkpatrick in *A Manual of Church Doctrine* (1919), after surveying the history of confirmation from apostolic times onwards, write as follows:

"It is clear, then, that no one Catholic doctrine or practice in the matter exists. The Anglican Archbishops have very well summed up the position [Letter to Leo XIII, 1877 (*sic*)] when they write: 'The matter of Confirmation (i.e., whether imposition of hands or chrism) is not entirely certain, and we at any rate do not think that Christians who have different opinions on the subject should be condemned by one another. . . . The Roman Church for many centuries has substituted a stretching out of hands over a crowd of children, or simply over those who are to be confirmed, in the place of laying on of hands on each individual. The Orientals (with Eugenius) teach that the matter is chrism, and use no laying on of hands in this rite. If therefore the doctrine about a fixed matter and form in the Sacraments were to be admitted, the Romans have administered Confirmation imperfectly for many generations, and the Greeks have none. It is clear that we cannot insist very strictly on that doctrine about a fixed form and matter: inasmuch as all Sacra-

ments of the Church, except Baptism, would in that way be rendered uncertain.' It is difficult on these principles to see what nullifying defect can be alleged against our Scottish practice of Benediction. It has not unction, but neither has the Anglican use. It has not imposition of hands in contact,[1] but neither has the East, nor till lately the unreformed West. It has the essential fact of Baptism solemnly and ceremonially confirmed, which is the only thing that other uses have in common. 'We at any rate do not think that Christians who have different opinions on the subject should be condemned by one another.'

"As to the proper Minister of this Act: the later Western use reserved its administration to the Bishop, and this reservation continues in Roman and Anglican practice. It cannot, however, be contended that the reservation is primitive, or that it is universal, or other than locally customary. Over the whole East the presbyter who baptizes also 'confirms' (if Unction be the analogue of Confirmation). Ambrose records that in Egypt the presbyters 'sealed' if the bishops were not present. Jerome says of his fellow presbyters: 'It becomes us to preach: it is useful that we bless: it is fitting that we confirm.' Gregory gave dispensation to the presbyters of Sardinia 'to anoint the Baptized'. Wordsworth shows that 'presbyterial confirmation was in use . . . in Gaul' (*c.* A.D. 500), and says that it was very common and indeed general in the West, wherever bishops were few. The Church of Scotland has not left Catholic order in reclaiming to presbyters that they shall 'complete' the Baptism which they have administered. We may say of her practice what an eminent Anglican writer has said of Anglican practice: 'We are . . . in at least as good a position' with 'regard to this ordinance as some other ancient Churches.' What we administer is effectually and substantially *confirmation*—and by common consent confirmation cannot be iterated."

W. A. Smellie.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Right Rev. F. A. Cockin, D.D., has been Bishop of Bristol since 1946.

The Very Rev. E. G. Selwyn, D.D., the first Editor of Theology, is Dean of Winchester.

The Rev. E. A. Payne, B.D., is General Secretary of the Baptist Union.

The Rev. W. A. Smellie, B.D., is Minister of St John's Kirk, Perth.

---

[1] It will be noted *supra* that by authority of *The Book of Common Order* (1940) the Church of Scotland may now have "the imposition of hands in contact". Neither *Prayers for Divine Service* (1929) nor the *Book of Common Order* (1928)—books issued with the authority of the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church of Scotland respectively, prior to the union of the Churches—has any rubric at all at this point in the enactment of the rite.

CORRESPONDENCE

LINGUISTIC PHILOSOPHY AND DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Surely the original contention of Professor A. J. Ayer and/or the Logical Positivists (or Linguistic Philosophers) was that *all* theological, metaphysical, or ethical propositions are sheer meaningless nonsense?

That is a universal negative, and as such (according, at least, to the old-fashioned logic) it can either be maintained or totally abandoned and repudiated: it cannot, in any proper sense, be "modified". If a man has asserted categorically that there are *no* black swans, and is afterwards compelled to admit that there is a whole species of them in Australia, he has not modified his original assertion, but flatly denied it.

If this is what Professor Ayer and his friends have done, let us no longer keep such a pother over them, but quietly get on with our theology, our metaphysics, or our ethics. If they have not done so, it behoves us, as Christians, to be wary of any "modifications", however specious, of what is still, at bottom, a materialistic and atheistic theory of the universe.

Yours truly,

PHILIP S. RICHARDS.

52, NORTH ROW,
PARK LANE, W.1.
17 *March* 1951.

Margaret Masterman writes:

No, of course theological and metaphysical propositions are not meaningless or nonsense; not by any criterion of meaning other than Ayer's, and Ayer's criterion of meaning won't hold. But it does not follow from that (not even by the old-fashioned logic) that Ayer's philosophical reflections are not worth the attention of theologians. For Ayer's thoughts and theories are not an isolated manifestation of gratuitous wickedness; they are the thoughts and theories which are likely to occur to any intelligent and thoughtful man who seriously considers the nature and structure of scientific thinking. Ayer's paradoxes are therefore *the* arresting paradoxes of our time; the central paradoxes of contemporary thought. They can be resolved—in my view—by considering the factors which Ayer considers even more deeply than he considers them. They can be ignored, however, only at the cost of ignoring the whole fact of the existence of science.

It may, of course, be right—over the short run, especially—to ignore the existence of science and "quietly get on with our theology, our metaphysics, or our ethics". As scholars we can, I think, if we wish, do this. It is as Christians that—as it seems to me—we can't.

TENT-MAKERS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I do not at all want to discourage the Church of England from adopting new and revolutionary measures, but their theological implications must be worked out first. However much one may sympathize with rural deans in their labours during vacancies and epidemics, such considerations are not enough to justify a drastic innovation like the ordination of a non-professional priesthood.

Expediency has already induced Anglicans to accept without question measures with which in principle they can hardly agree. The doctrine of the Church of England is, surely, that the sacramental function of the minister is an integral part of his whole office. A bishop confirms and ordains because he is the person to whom the oversight of the whole Church in a certain area is entrusted, and a priest when he celebrates sums up his work of bringing God to the people and the people to God. This doctrine has nothing to do with Barchester or Bishop Wilberforce: it is implied by the Ordinal itself. But we already have a class of confirming bishops whose territorial responsibility is little more than nominal. And now we are asked to sanction what looks very much like an order of "massing priests".

It is all very well for Mr Bennett to talk about probation officers. In a sense they are exercising a true pastoral ministry. But if the priesthood is open to one secular occupation, it must presumably be open to all (or all that can claim to be respectable), and the most sentimental upholder of the "dignity of manual labour" would find it difficult to discover much pastoral value in the jobs in which most people are employed. Besides, the Ordinal insists on the pastoral *responsibility* of the priest: responsibility which has little meaning unless related to a particular group of people. I do not see how a non-professional priest could accept such an obligation, whatever his calling, because his secular responsibility would be related to a different section of the community from that to which he would minister on Sunday.

It would, of course, be an entirely different matter if circumstances forced *all* priests to take a secular job (a possibility which Mr Bennett explicitly rules out). Then, the parson would still be the pastor of his flock, even though he could not give them all his time. It is also different with the "Priest-Workman" idea, because he is more or less the vicar of his factory. In the present case he is neither. As I say, he is little more than a "massing priest".

By all means let us adopt bold measures. But is this proposal much more than the "making shift and bolstering up" which Mr Bennett so rightly deprecates?

Yours faithfully,
R. C. BARSLEY.

2, KING STREET,
HEYWOOD, LANCS.
3 *April* 1951.

The Rev. Frank Bennett writes:

Mr Barsley's idea of what is involved in pastoral responsibility in the Church of England seems to differ so entirely from my own that it is hardly surprising that we disagree. "I do not see", he writes, "how a non-professional priest could accept such an obligation, whatever his calling, because his secular responsibility would be related to a different section of the community from that to which he would minister on Sunday." It is possible, of course, that by this he means a geographically different section, though I find it difficult to understand why that should be expected normally to be so. If, however, he means that the people among whom the priest worked on week-days would not, most of them, be churchgoers, the theological implications of his argument fill me with consternation. Our probation officer priest would then presumably, when he presided at the Eucharist, forget all about the people with whose problems he had been wrestling during the week. It seems to me an extraordinary idea of Christian priesthood. Small wonder if in such circumstances there should seem to be no need for devolution of pastoral responsibility and if the congregation should continue to see such responsibility as exclusively the concern of the curate and not at all of the Church. But this is an error (perhaps it peeps out by default from a post-medieval ordinal) which most of us have lately been engaged in trying to unteach. It would seem to have escaped Mr Barsley's notice that a measure of success has already attended these efforts, since otherwise he would hardly continue to expect that non-professional priests would inevitably be mere massing priests. It is not necessary to be a "sentimental upholder of the dignity of manual labour" to set value upon the pastoral opportunity which Christians in all sorts of employments are finding, if not in their jobs, then at their jobs.

I cannot share Mr Barsley's contempt of expediency. I did indeed in my previous letter have something to say about expediency and providence, but such is Mr Barsley's well-merited sympathy for rural deans that he appears not to have noticed certain arguments by which, truth to tell, I set more store than by my incidental reference to those officials.

I still believe that our inherited idea of a clergyman derives less from the ordinal than from a later time when a rise in land values rendered it unnecessary for country clergymen to engage in farming.

BOOK REVIEWS

Vraie et fausse Réforme dans l'Église. By Yves M.-J. Congar. Unam Sanctam 20. Éditions du Cerf. 950 frs.

This great volume of nearly 650 pages forms part of a treatise on the Church which the author hopes some day to complete. His readers will certainly join in that hope. Fr Congar says that the various sections of his projected work will be of unequal length, and the present reviewer, though he has read and, he believes, learned something from every page of the section now before him, yet thinks that it would be an even more valuable study of its subject if it were

rather briefer. Yet the generous scale on which it is written does enable the author to pursue his argument through its many ramifications with a satisfying weight and fullness which never fail to be impressive, and with a fairness which compensates for an occasional tendency to seek clarification of what is already clear. A review will perhaps serve a useful purpose if it aims primarily at describing the main course of the book's argument with some occasional comment. But it should be said at once that a great deal must be left unnoticed, or with the slightest reference, for no relatively summary account can do justice to a work so massive and so closely reasoned.

Its subject is the nature, the need, the opportunities, and dangers of "reform" or "reformation" in the Church, and the treatment of it is illuminated by frequent and thorough historical discussion. But it is not primarily a historical work: its purpose is to describe and measure contemporary thought and movements in the light of theological principle and of past experience. In his earlier pages the author is insistent that movements for reform in the Church of Rome of to-day are definitely not "modernist": they are not, in that sense, radical: on the other hand, they are widespread, they have strong lay support, they are based on sincere and realistic study of the relations of the Church and the world. They call for more realism in clerical education, in catechetical instruction, in preaching; for the reform of worship, the better organization of parochial work, the strengthening of the missionary spirit. They point to the wide gap between the spiritual and the secular in modern life and ask that far more strenuous and systematic effort should be made to bridge it. The changes demanded go beyond mere pressure for the removal of "abuses", if they stop short of anything that could be called "revolution". Those who demand them maintain that the Church is too often out of touch with, and has failed to take the measure of, the vast changes that have taken place in the character and attitude of the lay society whose conversion is the Church's task. In all this, Fr Congar believes, they maintain deep fidelity towards the true principles of the Church's life, "but there are circumstances when fidelity to principle cannot be fully maintained save at the price of some infidelity to the form in which the principle is expressed". This is a recurring note in the book, which insists repeatedly on the danger that the Church with its natural and historic conservatism may refuse too long to move: it may stay too long in the "synagogue" stage and temper, refusing to see the signs of the times, and, like the Pharisees, mistaking tried and familiar means for ends. No doubt there are often good reasons for this caution: this again is a recurring note: it is easy to dig up roots too often: traditionalists have often been right: yet after all, the story of tradition is itself a story of change: the "yogi attitude" and mere good intentions are not enough: the "prophet" has his due place and right in the Church, and the first main section of the book ends with a discussion of his functions. He is, characteristically, a man not "involved in the System", a man with special knowledge of the things of God, with a mission for the execution of God's plan, a

man of insight and foresight. His danger is one-sidedness. He has generally drunk deep of Augustinian springs and the Church has viewed with some disquiet a good many of St Augustine's enthusiastic disciples. Fr Congar hoists a danger signal against the prophet who strays beyond "le cadre de l'apostolicité".

The second part of the book, containing about one hundred and twenty pages, deals with "Conditions d'un Réformisme sans schisme". The reforming spirit always has its dangers: it easily passes into the spirit of contradiction, provoking an equally obstinate resistance. What are the conditions which enable it to do its best work? It must have deep roots in the soil of charity and of pastoral responsibility trying to work not for "une autre Église" but for "une Église autre"; for pastoral ministry is a great school of truth and, it is added, of understanding between "Catholic" and "Protestant". It must be in living touch with the whole body of the Church: too often it has been merely sectional and the creator of sects. It must be patient, recognizing that the hierarchy, with its wide responsibility and its inevitable suspicion of hasty change, will need time to weigh and consider new ideas and new projects and will instinctively suspect the theorist and the pundit. Finally, true reform must come not by the "mechanical" introduction of novelties, but by a deeper understanding of the Church's fundamental principles and especially of its liturgical life, so profoundly involved in the whole structure of the Church's body. But Fr Congar is far from forgetting the corresponding obligations of central authority. That authority has often been far too "patient", too ready to remain in the "synagogue": there is a "mechanical" conservatism as certainly as there is a "mechanical" radicalism: there can be "une fidélité mécanique à Saint Thomas". The author, by the way, makes a strong plea for a fuller representation of the "orbis" in the "urbs" lest Rome fall out of intimate touch with its world-wide constituency.

A natural transition leads in the third division of the book to a full and deeply interesting study of Reform and Protestantism in about a hundred and eighty pages. Here, as elsewhere in this work, but here most clearly and concretely, it is laid down that "une réforme Catholique" cannot aim at changing the essential traditional *structure* of the Church: its purpose must always be to reform its *life*. But the Protestant Reformation from the first struck at the roots: it brought with it a different conception of the Church (though claiming that this was a return to a more primitive conception), a different view of the relations of Church and Bible, of the part which "doctors" and the spirit of criticism are called to play in ecclesiastical life. The way had been paved by certain Augustinian emphases—for example, disjunction between the "pure" and the "visible" Church—by Occam and his followers, by Conciliar movements. The full result was seen in the work of the great Reformers. Luther's ecclesiology is examined in some detail, Zwingli's and Calvin's far more briefly as a prelude to an assessment of Protestant ecclesiology in general. It is urged that Protestantism has tended to destroy the conception of the Church as "body of Christ",

and to reduce the connexion between God and the world to something merely "tangential": the union between "visible" and "invisible" has been whittled away. Fr Congar has resort to diagrams to illustrate the contrast between the Catholic and Protestant doctrine. He goes on to ask some vigorous questions: Is the demand for perpetual "reform" under the Word of God really biblical? Do not Protestants in fact show themselves very firmly attached to their traditions? Is there reality in the call for general penitence? Is not too much stress laid on the O.T. "remnant" analogy? Has it not been forgotten that the Holy Spirit has been *given* and now dwells in the Church, no longer an occasional visitant as in the O.T.? But with his usual fairness, the author reminds his fellow Roman Catholics that the Spirit is none the less *free*.

There follows an admirably clear consideration of the Bible's place in Catholic and Protestant thought and life. The lines of it are, on the whole, familiar though fresh light is often thrown by the author's careful learning. There are a good many passages where a query suggests itself. Perhaps the most striking insistence—and it appears in other parts of the volume as well—springs from Fr Congar's fear that "doctors", the academic spirit and temper, play too large a part both in the past and present of Protestantism. He reminds us of the prominence of academic influence in later medieval and Reformation times and quotes, with apology but as expressing "une vérité des choses" a *mot* by M. Gilson: "God speaks, says K. Barth, man listens and repeats what God has said. Unfortunately, as is inevitable from the instant that a man becomes God's interpreter, God speaks, the Barthian listens and repeats what Barth has said." But there is much in these pages to suggest that the writer of them finds it far from easy to define the true function of scholars in the life of his Church and that he has his own anxieties about their due authority.

In his concluding chapter he emphasizes once again the reasons making for the general conservatism of the hierarchy. That conservatism is backed by the strong respect for tradition in the Catholic world and by a certain fear, among clergy and laity alike, of the tendencies of a world with whose ways of thought they are often unfamiliar. Hence there is real danger that necessary change may be too long resisted and may find its vent in ways damaging to the Church. On the other hand, history has often shown that the reformer who can bear to be patient is a mighty force: Lacordaire with his conviction that "la mesure est à la fois ce qu'il y a de plus rare et ce qui contient le plus de force" is set against the fiery and destructive radicalism of Lamennais. Fr Congar is, on the whole, hopeful about the future prospects of "reform". Those who are working for it are working on the pastoral plane, loyally and in a constructive spirit. But more mutual knowledge is needed between widely differing areas. And there is still sometimes an atmosphere of distrust and suspicion.

Two long appendices bring the book to an end. They deal with the growing sense of collective responsibility in the Church, both

for its present tasks and its past mistakes and misdoings, and with the true nature of fidelity, a subject of primary importance throughout the whole treatise.

This notice must conclude with a few comments on the impression left on one reader at least by a remarkable book. He believes that no one will read it without admiration and gratitude and without frequent agreement. Often, however, he cannot grant Fr Congar all his premisses. Too large an area is marked off as "irreformable", Despite wide and generous admission that Roman authority has often in the past been excessively slow in recognizing just demands for reform, too hard a judgment is passed on those who have, in the end, defied that authority. Great stress is laid on the hierarchy's guardianship of the deposit of faith, but we remember some astonishing and recent "developments" of that deposit. The Bible is given high place, but what is given with one hand seems here and there to be taken away by the other. The reader feels not seldom that the author himself is conscious of the razor-edge along which he walks. He condemns Protestants (p. 476 note) for the inadequate (misérable) consideration given by them to the biblical and historical bases for the Roman primacy, yet he allows that those bases have not always the irrefutable evidence ascribed to them by Catholic apologists. But this review of a book so rich in Christian wisdom and in just discrimination must not end on the note of criticism. Fr Congar has made a great addition to the service he had already rendered to the study of the Church, its doctrine, its dangers, and its opportunities.

ALWYN DUNELM:

PROBLEMS OF REUNION. By A. E. J. Rawlinson. Eyre and Spottiswoode. 9s.

The Bishop of Derby's worst enemies will never accuse him of making theology dull. "Too sharp, too quick, too clever," they may say—and Englishmen are a little frightened of these qualities—but "tame, heavy, tedious," never. Every page in this book is interesting, even exciting, not least towards the end where the writer deals with "The future of Anglicanism", but if you want light on the specific problems of Christian Reunion you will concentrate on the first four chapters, taking special care to read and mark the Preface. There Dr Rawlinson explains that to him divisions or schisms between Christians are "discords within the family". This does not mean that the divisions will prove easy to heal, for reunion between separated members of the family presupposes a "common acceptance of mutually agreed principles of Church Order".

But if such objective principles exist, is it not fair to say that some members have been more blind to them than others? Each must admit his own measure of responsibility for the sin of division and look across the barriers with real penitence as well as with charity and good will, but it does not follow that Anglicans should cease to thank God that in his providence no essential principle was com-

promised in the Reformation settlement, or that their praises should be offered in a lower key. This is not to adopt a Pharisaical attitude if we remember Dr Rawlinson's insistence that the reconciliation sought must be not only ecclesiastical and theological but moral. We very well know how possible it is to maintain the right principles in the wrong spirit, but it is no part of true penitence to loosen our hold on the one while we ask forgiveness for the other.

One gains the impression that the writer of this book is so anxious to rid himself of all bias that he has either forgotten or does not dare to express his special love for and pride in the English Church. He states her position admirably in chapter two, and we hope that he can scarce forbear to cheer—but we wonder.

Chapter three, the most controversial and arresting of all, contains a penetrating criticism of *The Apostolic Ministry* which Dr Rawlinson describes as "a brilliant and valiant attempt at historical reconstruction, but as a basis on which to erect what aspires to be a theologically binding doctrine of the Ministry, it rests on conjecture at too many points". He then takes up the cudgels—or rapiers—in defence of the South India experiment and successfully disposes of many unfair charges that are frequently levelled against it. Here again we could have wished to find some reference to the Lambeth caveat with its six points so characteristic of the Anglican position, but we look in vain and wonder why. The writer knows almost too well how to put himself in another man's shoes.

ERIC HAMILTON: BISHOP.

THE DEANERY,
WINDSOR CASTLE.

D. H. LAWRENCE AND HUMAN EXISTENCE. By Father William Tiverton. Foreword by T. S. Eliot. Rockliff. 12s. 6d.

While Mr Aldington's study is still fresh in the public memory, here is yet another book on D. H. Lawrence, and as it reaches me a third is being advertised. The writings of Lawrence—novels, poems, criticisms, travel books, and some essays like *Fantasia of the Unconscious*—are now being neglected, it appears, and especially by the young. One intention of these new books is of course to redirect attention to them. A cursory examination of this one in particular will show that that should be entirely to the benefit of the reading public. The numerous short passages which are cited in it are evidence, for those not already aware of the fact, that Lawrence was the author of many a pregnant saying about sexual love, about other writers, and about men's relation to nature and to the unseen powers. It is as well perhaps to have such sayings torn from their context; for the quest of them in their place must be to many a laborious and irritating exercise. But a volume of *morceaux choisis* is more to the purpose, and such a volume already exists in the Everyman Library. However, in addition it is claimed for this book that, being the pseudonymous work of "a priest of an Anglican religious order", it is the first attempt to approach Lawrence

"specifically from the Christian angle". Agreeing with the accepted opinion that he was primarily a writer with a message, it contends that Christians will find a great deal in the message worth hearkening to, because, although vitiated by pantheistic elements, it is the message of a deeply religious man.

So what? After all, we have at our disposal the writings of plenty of Christians with a message who were deeply religious men too. Why go to one who never so much as wished to have faith? It is Mr Eliot, at the end of his foreword, who answers the question. He says: "[Lawrence's] strictures upon Christianity (and indeed upon Buddhism) are often ill-informed; at other times they go straight to the heart of the matter; and no Christian ought to feel sure that he is religious-minded enough to ignore the criticism of a man who, without being a Christian, was primarily and always religious." But to heed the behest implicit in that passage means going to Lawrence's own books and not to that of any commentator. The work of the commentator under consideration here seems to be chiefly instructive through what it fails to do. That novels need to be judged by more than literary standards is a commonplace in France. There it has long been realized that every novel is more or less an interpretation of the world, or at least of some portion of the world, of men. Hence the French existentialism which "Father Tiverton" has had in mind in framing the title of his book. It is because fiction is necessarily the illustration of some *Weltanschauung* that a philosopher like Sartre has turned novelist and a philosopher like Marcel has turned playwright. To discuss Lawrence's imaginative writings in terms of his "message" is accordingly more than legitimate; it is highly desirable. But we have to remember that the message is not independent of its imaginative presentation. "Father Tiverton" says that his book "agrees with Lawrence that there is no such thing as pure literary criticism abstracted from all moral and metaphysical judgments". But we do have "pure literary criticism". We have, for instance, Percy Lubbock's *The Craft of Fiction*. The defect of that undertaking lies not in the "purity" of its literary criticism; it lies in the refusal to make any other criticism. It is the novelist who in the first place offers "moral and metaphysical judgments", which in turn need to be judged, even though Mr Lubbock says that "life" all of us already know. But it is equally otiose to confine criticism to that. The "message", the interpretation of life, which a novel is made to illustrate, can only be held up to inspection *after* the exigencies of technique, and their effect upon a reader, have been fully allowed for. Technique, however, finds no place in "Father Tiverton's" pages. Instead, he encumbers his argument with claims to recognize correspondences between characters in Lawrence's novels and Lawrence himself, his wife, and his friends. He remarks in the middle of his book: "It is dangerous to bring the 'personal element' into criticism." Why, then, has he done it? It is worse than dangerous; it is irrelevant. The extraction of the "message" from the writings and the judgment of it are stultified from the first.

MONTGOMERY BELGION.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Church in the Purpose of God. By Oliver S. Tomkins. S.C.M. Press. 2s. 6d.

This handbook is "an introduction to the work of the Commission on Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches in preparation for the Third World Conference on Faith and Order to be held at Lund, Sweden, in 1952". It is an admirable and eminently useful piece of work, containing an "Ecumenical Glossary" and nine chapters on a great variety of subjects concerned with the whole question of Church Unity, its history, its difficulties, the nature and diversity of its progress. There is also a full bibliography. One of the most valuable contents is a reprint (pp. 79–82) of a letter written by Dr C. H. Dodd which deserves the attention of members of all Churches.

Mr Tomkins has rendered the Churches a great service by this publication. Not only does it contain a mass of accurate, well-ordered information, but it asks a great many essential questions, and is eminently realist in its facing of obstacles. So concrete and concise is it that it does not lend itself to discussion in a review, but it can be said without hesitation that it should be in the hands and the minds of all those who are concerned for the great subject with which it deals.

Alwyn Dunelm:

The Dazzling Darkness. By Guy Bowden. Longmans. 8s. 6d.
Whose Leaf shall not Wither. By James M. Lichliter. Skeffington. 8s. 6d.
The Christian Mysteries. By Bede Frost. Mowbray. 8s. 6d.
The Good News. By T. Howard Somervell. Hodder and Stoughton. 8s. 6d.
Living the Creed. By Patrick Cowley. Faith Press. 4s. 6d.

Mr Bowden takes his title from a splendid couplet by Vaughan:

> "There is in God (some say)
> A deep but dazzling darkness."

The hope of the title is fulfilled in the book's apt quotations, and one is glad to recommend this aid to prayer for thoughful and interested youngsters. It is sound, readable, and directed at the anthropomorphic agnosticism of the modern.

He deals at length with aridity, and one is surprised that he does not hammer home the truth that the burden of responsible living is intolerable apart from adherence, patient, humble, and supplicating. In him, as in his counsellors (e.g. Archbisop Fénelon), one finds no reference to the divine wrath overshadowing our corporate life. In Fénelon's letters to devout aristocrats who bemoan their spiritual ennui, we seek in vain for him to say, "Look over the castle parapet and tremble."

Whose Leaf shall not Wither consists of addresses in the liberal

protestant manner. Easy to read, easier still to hear, and garnished with anecdote like a friar's sermon or the jottings of a top-line columnist. No doubt they fill the mouth of a middle-class congregation in a liberal culture, but have little to say to harder-pressed souls in bleaker surroundings or to those who, like the birds, prefer a little grit with their food, even in the summer time.

This reviewer has read, possesses, and finds still valuable earlier books by Bede Frost, whose *Christian Mysteries* is a disappointment. He expounds doctrine in circumlocutory style, making all seem academic and abstract. Not here the adept handling of old truths so that they come down with power among us.

The Good News consists of reflections on the life of Jesus by one who says that "the dogmas and theories, ritual and organization that man has invented through the centuries and with which he has surrounded Jesus Christ, have served only to obscure the Christ they were intended to honour". Sad to relate that his reflections surround the Christ with moralizing platitude. Somehow he manages again and again to take from the Gospel its fascination, its haunting power over the imagination, its numinosity. Jesus in his temptation is dramatized thus. "I am hungry and here are these stones lying about, just the shape of buns. Why should I not test my sonship of God and turn one of these bun-like stones into a real bun? No." How could a man, sensitive to words, who had heard of a bun-fight use "bun" gratuitously in such a context? The pungent brevity of "where your treasure is, there will your heart be also" is churned into the wordy flaccid "common sense" of "We cannot be in two places at once, and our energies cannot be directed into two entirely opposite tracks. We have got to choose—God and the treasure of mind and soul or money and the pleasures of the body and the comfort of the world". After this the saying pierces less deeply and applies less widely.

Living the Creed is the rather misleading title of a book of doctrinal instruction based on the Creed and given in free-and-easy style to school children. Before buying the book, ask a teacher of religious knowledge if the Creed is a good starting-point with children and if the breezy style is effective. I am dubious.

M. P. Ralph Bowman.

Ashbrittle.

The End of Time. By J. A. Chapman. Blackwell. 3s. 6d.

There is an impression about that to get newly composed verse into print is now a feat of considerable ingenuity and skill, and that for new verse to have a religious theme is now extremely singular. If that were true, then no doubt readers might deem it the duty of this periodical to acclaim the appearance of the above-named poem. It consists of thirty-eight delicately varied sonnet sequences, and Mr Chapman is not only thoroughly familiar with the *Divine Comedy*, but also has a Muse with a face as fresh as any beauty parlour could turn out. Indeed, the memory of the *Four Quartets* faintly haunts her song. The theme is religious, and it has surely been pondered

long and earnestly. However, the publication of such a poem to-day is not so odd. The impression that new verse is hard to print is false. The outlets are both wide and varied. Mr Roy Campbell runs one verse magazine, Mr Peter Russell another, and they are only two among a number. So, too, new verse in general does not ignore religion. Hence Mr Chapman, before his work was acclaimed, would have to supply more than in fact he does. "Shimr's name, and Hitler's, and Yazid's are named in heaven only for pity and scorn", he says. His thought should be less commonplace. He says that trooping of the colour should cease—"That way they dope you!" He should be old enough to remember how that was already said with firmer support after the first war.

M. B.

Our Task To-day. By C. J. Stranks. Mowbrays. 2s. 6d.
The Christian World State. By Arthur Wood. Independent Press. 7s. 6d.
Signs of Hope in a Century of Despair. By Elton Trueblood. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

Canon Stranks's book is most refreshing. There is in it none of the wishful thinking which is so often found in books of this kind. He reviews the present situation without underestimating either its opportunities or its difficulties. He analyses the causes of the despondency which is the special temptation of the English clergy to-day, and concludes that the only way open to the Church is the old way of teaching men the truths of the Gospel and training them in worship. There are some valuable suggestions about instructing congregations in the Bible and the Prayer Book, which, Canon Stranks believes, "should be taught side by side, the one illuminating the other". He ends with a timely reminder that the ultimate responsibility rests with God, and that so long as we do our duty faithfully in the Church and the world, that is all that is required of us. The contents of the book were originally delivered as lectures to a Diocesan Clergy School, and those who read them will find in them the same encouragement and practical help as the members of the school must have found.

Mr Wood's book might have carried more conviction if it had appeared fifty years ago. He regards the "State of God", of which the Sermon on the Mount is the "manifesto", as the main subject of the teaching of Jesus. But the State as he understands it begins and ends in this world. It is a future State only in the sense that "it comes as more and more individuals become its citizens, servants, and soldiers, and more and more areas of human life are dominated by its principles". Mr Wood has clearly been influenced by *Ecce Homo*, from which there are several quotations. But, unlike Seeley, he seems to ignore the supernatural claims of Jesus, and we are left with a picture of Jesus as the exponent of "a new ethical ideal". As we should expect, he takes an optimistic view of the development of human affairs. "Taking a sweeping view of history, who", he asks,

"can doubt that the Christian World State is gradually being established?" Like all those who set their hopes on a coming Utopia in this world, he has to face the problem of giving any sort of meaning to the lives of those who do not live to see the Utopia. He takes refuge in what he calls "the *law of continuity* which links the service of the men of one generation with the service of the men of another". Mr Wood's approach is one which was popular at the end of the last century. And he has worked out his thesis with great care. But it is difficult to believe that a version of Christianity from which all traces of the supernatural seem to have been removed is likely to have much appeal to-day.

Professor Trueblood is another optimist, but an optimist of a very different order. He describes the collapse of the belief in human progress. But he sees many signs of hope in the middle of what he calls "our world civil war", and he devotes the rest of his book to these signs. He speaks of the ecumenical movement, as it is expressed in the World Council of Churches; of modern theology, with its realistic view of man and its return to the "total Gospel"; and of the growth of "lay religion" and "redemptive communities" (the Christian Frontier and the Iona Community are given as examples, with similar experiments in America and elsewhere). Those who distrust "movements" on principle will find plenty to criticize. But few will quarrel with Professor Trueblood when he says that groups of dedicated people are the most hopeful way of carrying on the Church's redemptive work to-day. At a time when any ray of hope is welcome, we may be grateful to Professor Trueblood for his survey of some of the more hopeful signs of the times, and of some of the experiments which are being made in Christian living in a non-Christian world.

Sparsholt, Winchester. W. D. Maundrell.

Spiritualism, Reincarnation and Immortality. By Marcus Knight. Duckworth. 6s.

Canon Knight in his experience as a parochial clergyman knows how much or how little of informed and vital Christian faith can be taken for granted when exercising the pastoral office in times of bereavement. He recognizes that the general loss of faith in immortality is only part of the general lack of religious conviction, but he also senses a vaguely felt anxiety about it hidden away in the popular consciousness. So on the basis of a theologically grounded belief about the hereafter the author proceeds to an examination of the claims of reincarnation and spiritualism to meet the loss of Christian conviction. The discussion is marked as much by fairness as it is by clarity in exposing deficient doctrines of God and of moral responsibility in these systems; nor is there any lack of candour in suggesting omissions or distortions in the teaching office of the Church to account in part for their continuing appeal.

The author devotes a chapter to the subject of psychical research, and he duly notes the important, but often blurred, distinction between that scientific discipline and spiritualism as a religious cult.

This part of the discussion would have benefited if there had been fuller exposition of psychical research and the light it throws on the structure of human personality. For it is from this quarter that illumination is most likely to come at the point where it is most needed; and the author notes the need when he says "the whole subject is confused by disagreement on the terms to be used, the methods of proof, and the value of the results". Canon Knight regrets that the report made in 1938 to Archbishop Lang on the relation of psychical research and of spiritualism to the Christian faith was not published, for he thinks it would have given badly needed guidance to church people and spiritualists alike. Much of the desired guidance in these and related subjects will, however, be found in this compact volume. It has the inherent authority of careful scholarship and lively faith.

The Vicarage, Old Windsor. A. G. Coombs.

Simplicity. By Raoul Plus, S.J. Burns Oates. 6s.

After a thorough discussion of the various meanings of simplicity, Père Plus describes with almost an excess of illustration what is meant by simplicity as a Christian virtue. He is especially indebted to St Francis de Sales. One would hardly recommend this as the author's best book, but its lucid exposition will be congenial to others than Roman Catholics—until they reach the entry of the Double Standard in the last chapter, where they will surely learn with surprise that lots of folk nowadays are not after all "qualified" to take this "main road" to God (p. 114). But do not our Lord's strictures on hypocrisy suggest that the three component parts of simplicity—honesty with oneself, honesty with others, honesty with God—are of obligation for all Christians equally, even if, as Fr Faber said, "any one of these things is rarer than the Australian black swan"?

As an illustration of duplicity Père Plus tells the interesting story of Renan that he was once asked by the Hellenistic scholar Ménard to write a preface to a book of his. Renan wrote: "It is an easier matter to show how doctrines end up than to tell how they began." Ménard at once questioned this, so Renan hurriedly inserted a "not".

Wilfrid Browning.

Great Haseley.

The Home Book of Bible Quotations. Selected and arranged by Burton Stevenson. Allen and Unwin. 42s.

Jesus in His own Words. Compiled by Harold Roper, S.J. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

This Bible reference book is quite different from such standard works as Cruden's or Young's, and is not likely to replace them in the priest's library. The body of the compilation consists of "full" quotations arranged in alphabetical subject order. This main section is preceded by an alphabetical table of contents and followed

by an index which is "almost a concordance"—with this difference—the references given are not biblical, but page numbers in the central part of the book. Although an American publication, the Bible is quoted in the Authorized Version and English spelling is used throughout.

Fr Roper's life of Christ claims to "contain all the recorded utterances of Jesus Christ, arranged in their chronological order, with just sufficient commentary to explain the circumstances . . . and . . . to make their meaning clear". The value of such a book must be judged by its commentary, which is, for the greater part, Catholic and orthodox, but with the inevitable bias of Rome concerning the Church, the Virgin Mary, and St Peter. The Westminster Version of the New Testament is quoted and the commentary is easily understood.

J. L. BADGER.

HULL.

THE BOOK OF ACTS. By M. D. R. Willinck. Religious Education Press. 3s.

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS. By John A. Allan. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

These two books are intended to appeal to different classes of readers. Mr Willinck's "plain little book on Acts", as he modestly describes it, is for the use of teachers and others who "are not much interested in questions of scholarship and criticism". One of its merits is that the author himself has sufficient knowledge of these questions to enable him to obtrude them in such a way as to deepen interest in and enhance the religious value of the narrative. One notable exception is the vivid imaginative picture of "Dr Luke's" arrival at the villa of Theophilus, Roman official and recent convert, bearing a copy of the manuscript of his Gospel, and opening the conversation in the very words of his preface! At the end a second volume is promised and duly arrives. Here we feel that the author has his eye fixed on his audience, and not on the object. It may also be suggested that while most of the modern analogies cited in relation to the Pentecostal happenings are relevant, some would unfortunately seem to support Luke's own thaumaturgic conception of the working of the Spirit, which here gives a certain form and purpose to the *glossolalia*. Luke regards it as a miraculous gift of speaking in foreign tongues, equipping the apostles for their world-wide mission.

Dr Allan provides an interesting interpretation of the theological problems in Galatians in simple language. A brief running commentary is prefaced by an Introduction and usefully supplemented by four concise essays dealing with the principal issues at stake on this classical Pauline battle-ground. The Judaizers are Jewish Christians who reject the more liberal attitude of the Jerusalem Council of Acts 15. Galations 2. 1–10 refers to the same occasion. It is, however, questionable whether justification by faith is "the key phrase for the

understanding of Paul's religion". In Romans that place is occupied by "Reconciliation". The paradox of "justification", "acquittal without trial", suggests an idea caught up from the lips of opponents. It is also disproportionate to emphasize the "curse" of Gal. 3. 10–13 as an essential element in the Pauline thought of the Cross as vicarious suffering. Rather is it an uprush of that individual torturing pre-conversion experience so tersely described in Rom. 7. 9; the moment when "the law's demand" first seared the conscience of the devoted young rabbinical student. It would also have simplified his otherwise excellent interpretation of the Epistle if Dr Allan had recognized that the Jewish Torah included practically the whole of the Old Testament as we have it, along with the traditional rabbinical interpretations. Both Paul and his antagonists were contending for the same verbally inspired Bible. But while the rabbis confined the activity of the Holy Spirit to the long past, for Paul the creative influence is "the mind of Christ", the Spirit that "leads into all the truth". Dr Allan is at his best when he interprets the dominating place which Paul gives to the promise to Abraham as the assertion of God's dominating purpose in history, concentrated in the history of Israel, fulfilled in Christ and through him set free for all the world.

CAMBRIDGE. R. H. STRACHAN.

SCIENTIFIC AND RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE. By Gertrude E. Quinton. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

This book is to be welcomed as expressing an attempt to stimulate Sixth Forms to recognize some of the fundamental intellectual problems of our civilization. The cleavage in the spiritual and intellectual leadership of the Western world is one of its most serious weaknesses, and Christians seem to have had relatively little success yet in assimilating the scientific world-view with Christian philosophy. This book must therefore also be welcomed as an attempt to tackle this job. Much that it has to say on the religious side is good and relevant; and it is useful to have the scientist's assumptions (or "faith") about the nature of the universe brought out clearly. It is a pity that Miss Quinton did not make the book longer and fill out the meanings of some of the portmanteau-words she uses; for example, "encounter", "existence", "judgment", and "self-disclosure".

On the scientific side the book is weaker. One may legitimately use the word "science" in a broad sense, to include various descriptive and historical studies. But if this is done it is still essential to recognize that the intellectual prestige of science is due primarily to the certainty of its results; that this certainty holds only in regard to processes or repeated sequences of events; and that scientific laws or "rules of succession" can become established only by means of measurement. The failure to recognize this weakens many of Miss Quinton's remarks, for example on evolution and miracles.

A scientific reader is left with an uneasy feeling that Miss Quinton has had to fight a legion of hard-bitten scientific atheists: she does

not seem willing to credit the scientific agnostic with sincerity or to allow his arguments any weight. Possibly this failing is due to her not having tried to live by the arguments she is refuting. My point is that if scientific thinking is to be genuinely assimilated into the Christian view, the Christian has to go a very long way with the scientist in his argument, meeting him in all the facts and scientific laws and exploring with gentle touch to find just where he differs in his interpretation of them. Perhaps it can hardly be done except by people of opposed views working intimately together, or by somebody who has lived a long time on the borderland.

EXETER. K. G. COLLIER.

BAPTISM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Oscar Cullmann, tr. J. K. S. Reid. Studies in Biblical Theology No. 1. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

Impressionistic gossip of theologians a few years ago had it that the only point on which Barth and Brunner were still agreed was opposition to infant baptism. Cullmann upholds it strongly against both, and in a short work of first-class scholarship supplies a powerful answer to Barth's theory of baptism being a mere "*cognitio* of salvation". By making this book available in English the S.C.M. Press has done a great service to all who are seeking for light on the profoundly difficult problem of the administration of infant baptism to-day; it is a work of real theological skill at just the level at which investigation was required. Cullmann supplies a refreshing clarification of many obscure questions such as the place of faith in infant baptism, prevenient grace, the spiritual status of the baptized, the complexities of adult baptism in relation to infant baptism and many more. The author expounds the meaning of the O.T. language and imagery used in the accounts of the baptism of Christ and hence imparts an understanding of our own baptism in O.T. terms. There is much illumination here of the ideas of collective holiness and family solidarity, but when the writer comes to a *crux* he more than once refers to another work of his for a more complete answer, and this makes one hope that soon his other researches will be available for English readers. The chapter on Baptism and Circumcision would have helped the participants in the recent controversy on that subject in THEOLOGY. In an appendix the author sets out with admirable clarity his theory of an early baptismal formula underlying the word κωλύειν in the New Testament—e.g., in Mark 10. 14, Acts 8. 36, etc. Incidentally, there are many useful references to recent continental works on the theology of baptism.

BAPTISM IN THE CHURCH. By J. R. S. Taylor and F. J. Taylor. Church Book Room Press, Ltd. 2s.

This volume contains an essay on the history of baptismal belief and practice by a sometime member of the staff of Wycliffe Hall, and another on the problems of baptismal discipline in the contemporary Church of England by the Bishop of Sodor and Man, a sometime

Principal of the same college. The historical section of the book merely takes us through the principal vagaries of belief and custom connected with this sacrament, and does not make a serious attempt to investigate the underlying theology of baptism at any particular stage. The reader is made to suspect that the essay is an expansion of lecture notes, and the result smells somewhat of the lamp.

The second essay consists of thirteen pages of extracts from, and comments upon, reports of committees of Convocations which have recently discussed the theology and practice of baptism and confirmation. The impression given is of a conversation among gentlemen who have not really "done their prep." and who are in a hurry. This is almost confessed in places—"the committee was not conspicuous for its theological strength"; "We nowhere attempted to say how much theological meaning it [infant baptism] can bear, which is the whole crux of the matter"; "the work of the committee had to be completed in eight crowded days". All this perhaps explains such things in the essay as the naïve separation of "pastoral rather than theological issues" (p. 46)!

BLANDFORD ST MARY. J. C. S. NIAS.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: H. D. Lewis, *Morals and Revelation* (16s.); Gote Bergsten, *Pastoral Psychology* (15s.).

BLACKWELL: G. Goyder, *The Future of Private Enterprise* (9s. 6d.).

BRITONS PUBLISHING SOCIETY: G. E. Dillon, *Grand Orient Freemasonry Unmasked* (5s.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: A. M. Ramsey, *F. D. Maurice and the Conflicts of Modern Theology* (10s. 6d.).

COUNCIL OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS: A. J. Polack, *Tolerance: can it be taught?* (6d.).

ECCLESIA (ATHENS): J. N. Karmiris, *The New Dogma of the Roman Church concerning the Bodily Assumption of the Mother of God* (in Greek).

FABER AND FABER: N. Gangulee, *Thoughts for Meditation* (9s. 6d.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: T. C. Hammond, *In Understanding be Men* [New Edition] (6s.); *Evangelical Belief* (1s.); *The Search* (1s. 6d.); F. Mitchell, *The Stewardship of Money* (1s.).

R. H. JOHNS (NEWPORT, MON.): Vera Barclay, *Morning Star and other Poems* (2s.); A. Gille, *More Professional Prayers* (4s. 6d.).

R.E.P.: W. P. Cleland, *The Cross-Roads of History*.

ROCKCLIFF: Marie Magdeleine Davy, *The Mysticism of Simone Weil* (5s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: H. Cunliffe-Jones, *Deuteronomy* (8s. 6d.); Hugh Martin, *The Lord's Prayer* (7s. 6d.).

SCRIBNERS: Paul Ramsey, *Basic Christian Ethics* ($3.75).

PAUL SIEBECK: Helmut Thielicke, *Theologische Ethik*, Vol. I (n.p.).

S.P.C.K.: L. E. Browne, *The Messianic Hope in its Historical Setting* (3s.); J. C. Gill, *The Councils of the Church* (1s. 6d.); Lord Quickswood, *The Ministry of Women in the Statutory Services* (9d.); Archbishop Germanos of Thyateira, *Kyrillos Loukaris 1572–1638* (1s. 3d.).

WATTS AND CO.: S. C. Champion and D. Short (Eds.), *Readings from World Religions* (18s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher